

# WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD

January 27, 2005

South Puget Sound Community College

Percival Room

2011 Mottman Road SW

Olympia WA 98512

(360) 754-7711 X 5217

## AGENDA

Time: 8:30 a.m. to 12:45 p.m.

TIME	TOPIC	PRESENTER	DESIRED OUTCOME
8:30-8:45	Welcome/Introductions	David Harrison	Get Acquainted.
8:45-9:15	Minutes of November 18, 2004	David Harrison	Board will act on minutes of November 18, 2004.
	Chairperson's Report		Board will be updated on current issues of interest.
	Executive Director's Report	Ellen O'Brien Saunders	
	<i>Tab 1</i>		
9:15-9:30	Federal Legislative Changes: Board's Role and Process	Bryan Wilson	Board will discuss and act on its process for fulfilling its advisory role to the Governor and Legislature in the event of changes in national legislation.
	<i>Tab 2</i>		
9:30-10:00	<i>High Skills, High Wages 2004</i> : Integrated Performance Information Project's Blueprint for the States	Bryan Wilson	Board will review and endorse Blueprint, including Integrated Performance Information Project measures.
	<i>Tab 3</i>		
10:00-10:15	Break	All	Refresh

TIME	TOPIC	PRESENTER	DESIRED OUTCOME
10:15-10:45	<i>High Skills, High Wages 2004:</i> Workforce Development Council Strategic Plan Updates  <i>Tab 4</i>	Pam Lund	Board will review and act on its process for reviewing and approving local strategic plans.
10:45-11:00	Customer Satisfaction Measures: Improving Service  <i>Tab 5</i>	Bryan Wilson Mehrnaz Jamzadeh	Board will learn of efforts to improve scores for customer service.
11:00-11:30	Health Care Personnel Shortage Task Force Update  <i>Tab 6</i>	Madeleine Thompson	Board will learn of major accomplishments of 2004 and needs for 2005.
11:30-12:45	Working Lunch	All	Prepare for meeting with Higher Education Coordinating Board.
12:45	Adjourn to Travel to Joint Meeting with Higher Education Coordinating Board	All	

Tab 1

## **LOCKE PROPOSED 05-07 BUDGET – WORKFORCE-RELATED ITEMS**

### **State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC)**

#### **Enrollment Growth:**

In FY 2006 \$10,116,000 and \$21,798,000 in FY 2007 in General Fund-State (GF-S) funding for an additional 3,633 enrollments (1,686 in Fiscal Year 2006 and 1,947 in Fiscal Year 2007). All FTE students are funded at \$6,000. The two-year colleges will commit 20 percent of the new enrollments (727) to programs with a gap between employer demand and the number of college degrees conferred in the field as identified by Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board). The remainder of the enrollments will be allocated to the college districts based on the 2005-07 enrollment plan. General enrollments will support academic transfer, workforce education, and basic skills.

**SBCTC Request:** \$84.75 million in GF-S monies for 10,000 new enrollments for the 2005-07 biennium funded at an enhanced level of \$5,650 per student FTE (10 percent committed to high demand fields).

#### **Job Skills Program:**

\$5 million from GF-S to the Job Skills Program. Currently the program is funded at \$2.95 million from the Administrative Contingency account. This funding is expected to increase the number of workers trained by up to 2,000, in addition to the more than 2,500 workers served by the existing base funds. SBCTC is required to make an annual report to the Legislature.

**SBCTC Request:** An additional investment of \$7.05 million in the 2005-07 biennium, bringing total funding to \$10 million from GF-S.

#### **Adult Basic Education Enhanced Funding:**

\$5 million of GF-S to add approximately \$125 per FTE student to sustain the more than 19,000 adult basic education FTE students currently being served by the system.

**SBCTC Request:** \$10 million in GF-S dollars to maintain current adult basic education FTEs service levels.

#### **Workforce Board Endorsed SBCTC Request Not in the Budget:**

SBCTC requested \$33 million (\$11 million in 2005-06 and 22.3 million in 2006-07) to improve colleges' competitiveness in the employment marketplace by providing recruitment and retention increases to community and technical college employees.

### **Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)**

#### **Academic Achievement and Accountability (A+) Commission/State Board of Education (SBE):**

The A+ Commission and staff are eliminated and their responsibilities are transferred to a redefined SBE (bill to follow). A savings of \$239,000 in GF-S dollars is anticipated.



**Core Student Record System:**

\$1,559,000 (2.0 FTE) in GF-S dollars is provided to OSPI to complete development of the **core student record system**, including a secure student identifier that can be used to inform individualized instruction for students and to evaluate program effectiveness.

**College Courses in High Schools:**

\$2,149,000 in GF-S monies for increasing the numbers of high school students that pursue opportunities to **participate** in dual credit courses (bill to follow). OSPI will provide school districts with \$140 per student per course which must be transferred to the appropriate in-state college or university to off-set the students' participation fees of \$280 per course. For students eligible for free or reduced price lunch, the allocation rate will be \$280 per student per course.

**Workforce Board Endorsed OSPI Requests Not in the Budget:**

- \$1.495 million in GF-S dollars for the 2005-07 biennium to expand use of an effective guidance and counseling model developed by the Franklin Pierce School District, including continued development and refinement of on-line guidance and planning tools for students and their families.
- \$3.593 million in GF-S dollars for the 2005-07 biennium to increase the number of students who can be served by vocational skill centers, the number of hours students can be enrolled in programs, and the amount of funding for program equipment.
- \$19.621 million in GF-S expenditure authority for the 2005-07 biennium that would accommodate a change in salary rules that would allow the occupational experience of vocational certificated instructors to be recognized as the highest degree level regardless of any previous related degree earned.

**Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB)****High-Demand Enrollments:**

In FY 2006 \$8,800,00 and \$17,600,000 in FY 2007 in GF-S for 800 FTE students (at an average of \$11,000 per FTE student) in FY 2006 and 800 FTE students in FY 2007 for enrollments in high demand fields. Priorities for funding including careers in (1) nursing and other health services; (2) applied science and engineering; (3) teaching and speech pathology; (4) computing and information technology; and (5) viticulture and enology.

HECB Request: \$10,035,000 in FY 2006 and \$20,035,000 in FY 2007 in GF-S for grants to the public baccalaureate institutions and the community and technical colleges for worker retraining and high demand FTEs (i.e., 170 worker retraining FTEs and 830 high-demand FTEs in 2006).

**Workforce-Related HECB Request Not in the Budget:**

HECB requested \$2 million dollars in GF-S for a pilot program that would allow the state to provide financial aid to low-income, full-time workers to pursue part-time education.

## Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board Health Care Skill Panel Enhancement Funding

There are 12 Health Care Skill Panels in Washington State managed by the 12 Workforce Development Councils (WDCs). In December 2004, five of six eligible panels submitted applications to the Board requesting WIA Title I-B enhancement funding to continue the efforts of regional health care skill panels for a six-month period (January 1, through June 30, 2005). See attached application guidelines. The five WDC applications were approved for funding. Continued Board support for health care skill panels is consistent with Health Care Personnel Shortage Task Force strategic priorities. Skill Panel project enhancements are described below:

Northwest Workforce Development Council  \$10,000	The Northwest Alliance for Health Care Skills (Skill Panel) will provide staff support to: (1) convene regular panel meetings; (2) market health occupations to middle and high school students; (3) continue to build the <a href="http://www.healthcarework.info">www.healthcarework.info</a> web site to link job seekers and WorkSource staff to local health care employers and career information; (4) survey employers to identify new industry skill gaps; and (5) form public/private partnerships to leverage resources for workforce training.
Tacoma-Pierce County Workforce Development Council  \$10,000	The Pierce County Health Services Careers Council (Skill Panel) will continue to address critical workforce shortages in health care. Staff and panel members will initiate an <i>In Demand Scholarship Program</i> and deploy a cross industry career awareness campaign to K-12 teachers and counselors to increase the number of youth accessing industry supported training during and after high school. Health Occupations Workshop (HOW) booklets will be distributed.
Workforce Development Council of Seattle-King County  \$10,000	Funds will be used to support the two Seattle-King County Healthcare Skill Panel workgroups. The first group will work with participating hospitals to expand the Career Pathways Program and examine its return on investment. The second group will serve as the advisory board to the Nursing Pathways for Youth, a new training program coordinated by the WDC, Renton School District, Renton Technical College, and the Washington Hospital Association's Health Work Force Institute.
Olympic Workforce Development Council  \$10,000	In the first three months of 2005, the Olympic Health Care Alliance (Skill Panel) plans to develop a strategic plan with goals, objectives, and strategies for overcoming workforce barriers. Panel staff and panel members will also oversee a medical occupations scholarship program, a basic medical terminology-training project, and a Nursing Assistant Certified (NAC) Mentor Training Feasibility Study.
Pacific Mountain Workforce Development Council  \$10,000	The Pacific Mountain Health Skill Panel will continue to oversee incumbent worker training for high-demand health professions (Sec. 503 Performance Incentive projects). In the next six months, panel members, including major employers and colleges in the region, plan to assess resources needed to maintain current college health care training capacity and expand programs to meet industry workforce needs.

**APPLICATION GUIDELINES**  
**TO REQUEST FUNDS TO SUPPORT HEALTH CARE SKILL PANELS**  
**NOVEMBER 5, 2004**

On December 31, 2002, the State Health Care Personnel Shortage Task Force sent a report to Governor Locke and to the members of the Legislature recommending priority strategies to alleviate Washington's health care personnel shortage and build the workforce of the future. The state task force assigned Priority Strategy 5.1.1 to the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) to:

Provide continuing support to current Health Skills Panels and expand the formation of health skill panels to cover all 12 workforce development areas.

In addressing this priority strategy, the state Workforce Board invites six Workforce Development Councils (WDCs) to consider applying for 2005 Health Care Skill Panel enhancement funding.

The Seattle-King County WDC, Tacoma-Pierce County WDC, Pacific Mountain WDC, Olympic WDC, Benton-Franklin WDC, and Northwest WDC may each apply for up to \$10,000. The period of performance is scheduled to begin on or about January 1, 2005, and end no later than June 30, 2005. The due date for applications is December 3, 2004.

Required "2005 Health Care Skill Panel Enhancement" contract activities:

- Convening and facilitating Health Care Skill Panel meetings and events.
- Participating at the spring 2005 statewide AHEC meeting (please build this cost into your budget).
- Supporting travel and related costs to network and share information with other health care skill panels.
- Providing updated information on skill panel activities to the Health Care Personnel Shortage Task Force, the Area Health Education Centers (AHECs), and the Workforce Board.

Other optional "2005 Health Care Skill Panel Enhancement" activities:

- Updating labor market information.
- Conducting employer surveys to help identify new industry skills gaps.
- Coordinating the formation of public/private partnerships to leverage resources for workforce training.
- Promoting work-based learning opportunities.
- Planning and development costs for special youth events such as health care camps and industry tours.
- Advancing activities that connect WorkSource staff with employers in the industry.
- Other skill panel activities supporting strategic planning for workforce development.

Applications are due to the Workforce Board on December 3, 2004. Please submit your application electronically to Pam Lund at: [plund@wtb.wa.gov](mailto:plund@wtb.wa.gov) and to Gena Anderson at: [ganderson@wtb.wa.gov](mailto:ganderson@wtb.wa.gov). A hard copy should be mailed the same day addressed to:

Pam Lund, Associate Director  
Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board  
PO Box 43105  
Olympia, Washington 98504-3105

## **Application Instructions**

### **Narrative**

1. Describe how 2005 Health Care Skill Panel Enhancement contract funds will be used to help support the Skill Panel's plans in progress. Please describe required activities and optional activities during the contract period.
2. Include a basic plan-of-work that includes: (a) project tasks; (b) planned outcomes; and (c) a time line.
3. Describe the Health Care Skill Panel's current workforce priorities and how the panel is anticipating future industry needs.
4. Describe the roles of partner organizations participating on the panel. Note: The panel must include representation from industry representatives and from the WDC, economic development council(s), labor, and community or technical college(s).
5. Complete a cover page and budget sheet.

If you have any questions, please contact Martin McCallum at (360) 586-0151 or via e-mail at [mmccallum@wtb.wa.gov](mailto:mmccallum@wtb.wa.gov)

**WASHINGTON STATE  
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD  
MEETING NO. 101  
JANUARY 27, 2005**

**CIVIL SERVICE REFORM**

The 2002 Personnel System Reform Act (SHB 1268) was passed by the 2002 Washington State Legislature and signed into law by Governor Locke. The legislation, when fully implemented, revises the state's civil service system that has been largely and unchanged for over 40 years. This major overhaul of the state's civil service system:

- Simplifies rules and processes for hiring, promotions, compensation, layoffs, and corrective/disciplinary action.
- Streamlines the job classification system to facilitate more effective use of state personnel resources and enhances mobility and career opportunities for state employees.
- Supports performance-based government.

The following is a brief summary of key items of the 2002 Personnel System Reform Act and anticipated Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) and staff activities to implement the Act.

**Civil Service Reform**

**Classification** – The current classification system consisting of 2,400 job classes will be consolidated into broad occupational categories. Positions are determined by skills and responsibilities and allow for flexibility to adapt to changing needs. The Workforce Board will review these revised categories and provide general comment, if necessary, on how they apply to the Workforce Board. Following adoption of the revised categories by the Department of Personnel, individual position descriptions for each staff person within the Workforce Board will be developed and reviewed for consistency. These descriptions will accurately reflect the duties of the positions and identify how each job addresses the needs of the Workforce Board.

**Compensation** – Flexibility, options, and performance recognition will drive salary adjustments. For positions in the bargaining unit, compensation is subject to the collective bargaining agreement between the State and the Washington Federation of State Employees. Key staff at the Workforce Board will attend training and become familiar with the intricacies of new compensation rules and the impact of collective bargaining agreements.

**Recruitment and Selection** – The Workforce Board will have more flexibility in filling positions. Key agency staff will attend training on the conduct and implementation of recruitment and selection practices so that the agency may identify desirable qualifications and competencies in filling positions.

**Performance Management** – State government will reflect a performance-based culture. Evaluation of staff will be based on the new Performance and Development Plan (PDP). Workforce Board supervisors and other staff are presently attending training to learn how to use this new tool. A transition to the new evaluation will occur between now and July 1, 2005. The

Workforce Board will also review, in the coming months, the relationship of the PDP to current employee performance agreements.

### **Collective Bargaining**

A significant aspect of Civil Service Reform is the ability of employees to negotiate wages, benefits, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment. Workforce Board staff, with the exception of exempt and Washington Management Service appointments, will be covered by the ratified Master Contract between the State and the Washington Federation of State Employees. The Master Contract becomes effective July 1, 2005 and supersedes the existing agency contract, policies, and procedures and may override some new civil service rules. The Workforce Board will conduct a thorough review of its existing policies and procedures to insure compliance with the new Master Contract. Key Workforce Board staff will participate in a series of training modules available from the State's Labor Relations Office.

### **Contracting Out of Services**

Another key aspect of Civil Service Reform is the removal of the prohibition on contracting out services traditionally and historically provided by state employees. Competitive contracting is allowed with state employees having the opportunity to compete for the work. Workforce Board staff will attend available training and monitor the progress of this provision.

### **Human Resources Management System**

The State has been developing and testing a replacement computer system for core payroll and personnel capabilities. This system is expected to go live in the next few months and be operational on July 1, 2005. Known as Release 1, key agency and Office of Financial Management Small Agency Client Services staff are currently attending training and will continue training as we approach July 1, 2005. Workforce Board management staff will also attend end user orientation to understand the full utility of the new system. Release 2 will focus on determining what is needed to support the new collective bargaining agreement and to provide functions for training, electronic recruiting, cost and compensation planning, and expanded employee self-service options. Staff participation in training will also occur with Release 2.

### **New Civil Service Rules**

The Department of Personnel has replaced the Merit System rules with newly developed rules consistent with the Personnel Reform Act of 2002. Changes in the classification system, compensation, recruitment and selection, performance management and separation are contained in these new rules, which become effective July 1, 2005. Key Workforce Board staff will attend training on the new rules.

# *Workforce Strategies 2004:*

## Leading in a Global Economy

### Conference Evaluation Summary

Shortly after the Workforce Strategies Conference (held in Tacoma, Washington on November 9-10, 2004) an evaluation form was electronically mailed to conference attendees. The form asked attendees to rate certain aspects of the conference and to provide suggestions on how to improve future conferences. Their responses<sup>1</sup> are summarized below.

	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: space-between;"> <span>Poor</span> <span>←————→</span> <span>Excellent</span> </div>						2004	2003
	1					6		
What is your overall evaluation of the conference?	0	0	3	22	38	35	5.1	4.8
Plenary sessions (How did we do in selecting plenary speakers and topics?)	0	1	8	15	41	32	5.0	4.6
Breakout Sessions (How did we do in selecting topics and experts for the sessions?)	0	0	8	17	48	25	4.9	4.8
Please rate the design and usefulness of the Conference Program and "At-A-Glance" materials.	0	0	3	15	37	43	5.2	5.2
Please rate the quality of the physical facilities.	0	2	12	18	41	24	4.7	4.6
							5.0	4.8

**Attendees were asked to list the conference highlights. Their responses are summarized here:**

**General.** The written comments on the evaluation forms were very positive. Conferees thought the event was very well organized. They felt that the conference theme was most appropriate. They liked the plenary sessions, the breakout topics, and the networking opportunities. In their own words: "The panels and speakers were excellent. It was great to see the different opinions and perspectives on issues with dialog and interaction rather than just speeches." "I enjoyed this conference much more than last year." "Every session was great and right on track to my interests. Thank you!"

**Plenary Sessions.** Conferees were very enthusiastic about the plenary sessions. J.D. Hoyer was mentioned numerous times: "Inspiring, motivating, on point, and great for challenging the notion of 'leadership'." The opening plenary, "Perspectives on the Global Economy," received many accolades as did the CEO roundtable, "Home Office: Planet Earth." The "Governor's Awards for Best Practices" was well received. Several appreciated that Senator Cantwell supported the conference and recognized the Best Practice winners. They liked watching the

<sup>1</sup> We received 99 responses, for a 22 percent response rate.

best practice videos. "I enjoyed learning about best practices like the Franklin Pierce culminating project model. This was information that I could take back and implement." "The award videos were great - very well structured, informative, entertaining and of professional quality"

**Break Out Sessions.** Attendees liked the wide variety of breakout sessions and presenters. "I thought the topics were tantalizing, the panels dealt with reality, and national and local perspectives were presented and discussed." Of the breakouts, the Washington State Legislators session received the highest praise. The "Emerging Policy" sessions came in a close second. Participants appreciate our bringing in national experts and show no signs that their interest is waning, despite the fact that we repeat these sessions each year. The out-of-state speakers received praise, especially the Indiana and Maryland experts, Linda Woloshansky and Robert Schaefer. Several mentioned the health care experts from Maryland and Oregon. Marine Clusters, Best Practices, Work Readiness Profile, Global Sourcing also received praise.

**Networking Opportunities.** As usual, conferees appreciate the opportunities to network with others. Many people commented about the fact we give adequate time for people to meet each other and share ideas. "One of the best things at the conference."

**Attendees were asked to suggest improvements that might strengthen the conference. Their responses are summarized below.**

There were a few suggestions for better food, more space, and better facilities, but these did not appear to be major issues for attendees. Most of the improvements suggested by the conferees related to the breakout sessions. Several would like the breakout sessions to be longer, with fewer panelists and longer times given for question and answer periods. They also used this section to suggest topics for our 2005 conference (see below).

**Participants were asked to suggest topics and speakers for future conferences.**

#### Topic suggestions

The top request from conferees is for more business involvement. They want to hear from such companies as Microsoft and Bank of America. They also want more sessions on Best Practices, including those supported by the Department of Labor. Several ask for more information on how to successfully integrate partners in a WorkSource Center. Still others suggest that we give more time to the role of economic development in workforce development. The Community Colleges want us to orient the conference more to community college issues and the K-12 system folks want us to orient the conference more to the K-12 system. One person suggested that we schedule "special interest" discussion groups, where folks can share ideas.

#### Other suggested topics

- Idaho and Oregon workforce incentives compared to Washington - the dilemma for border communities.
- More discussion on what various Workforce Development Councils are doing.
- Rural issues.
- More on the Work Readiness Certificate – especially from states who have one in place.
- More information about the changing nature of work



Speaker suggestions

Roland Barth (about what works and what doesn't in education and employment)

Bob Drewe

Mary Jo Waits (about clusters)

Economic Policy Institute

Brian Bosworth

Stuart Rosenthal

Karen Segren and Beverly Kimble (upgrading information technology skills and standards for WorkSource staff)

**Conference planners' favorite comments...**

"Conference flow was absolutely perfection!"

"Overall design of conference is top-notch - on par with corporate conventions (i.e., doesn't feel like a government show)."

"Overall, the Workforce Strategies conference was of good quality. I was intrigued by the variety of breakouts. Thanks to all of you for your hard work in planning & successfully 'carrying out' this conference. See you in Spokane in '05."

**Washington State Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board**  
**Minutes of Meeting No. 100**  
**November 18, 2004**

Ms. Ellen O'Brien Saunders called the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) meeting to order at 8:53 a.m. at WorkSource Center in Renton, Washington. The following board members were present:

David Harrison, Workforce Board Chair  
Asbury Lockett, Business Representative  
Beth Thew, Labor Representative  
Julianne Hanner, Business Representative  
Jim Crabbe (Alternate for Earl Hale), State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC)  
Mike Hudson, Business Representative  
Randy Loomans (Alternate for Rick Bender), Labor Representative  
John McGinnis, Labor Representative  
Deb Bingaman (Alternate for Dennis Braddock), Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS)  
Kyra Kester (Alternate for Terry Bergeson), Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)  
Ellen O'Brien Saunders, Executive Director

**Welcome**

Ms. Nancy Loverin, director of WorkSource Renton, welcomed the Board and guests.

**MDRC Overview**

Ms. Ellen O'Brien Saunders updated the Board on the Manpower Development Research Corporation (MDRC) project. The state has resisted participation up to now but this version of research has a benefit to participants. The project involves testing strategies, increasing skills and earnings, bringing income support services into One-Stops, incumbent working training, integrating WorkFirst and WorkSource, and transportation and childcare assistance for participants. She mentioned the need for consistent evaluation for this program with the other workforce programs.

**Executive Director's Report**

Ms. O'Brien Saunders briefed the Board on the House Commerce and Labor Committee work session on construction. She noted that it was a good discussion of the huge need in the construction industry, and highlighted the Center of Excellence at Renton Technical College as well as the Pierce County Skill Panel..

## **Skill Panel Reports**

Ms. Pam Lund reviewed the process for the recent skill panel awards. The panel reviewed twenty-seven papers and over \$2 million in requests. Then the interview team traveled throughout the state to further the review panel's ability to evaluate each contender. This method is expanding our past process. Ms. Julianne Hanner was pleased with the diversity of the candidates and enjoyed participating. Mr. Mike Hudson thought going to the locations was great and good exposure for the Workforce Board. Ms. Randy Loomans would like to see all agencies score the same using uniform scoring methods and criteria. Mr. Hudson noted that he attended all three interview panels and felt they were very consistent.

## **Chair's Report**

Mr. David Harrison welcomed the Board and guests and introductions were made. He apologized for his tardiness. He welcomed Ms. Jill Wakefield, South Seattle Community College, and encouraged her input. He then noted his satisfaction with the Workforce Strategies conference and praised Ms. O'Brien Saunders and staff for their efforts. He thought it was the place to be, had great plenaries nicely complemented by the breakout sessions, and was great success. Ms. O'Brien Saunders stated that the conference evaluation had not been received yet but we need to start thinking of a theme for next year.

## **Minutes of Board Meeting 99, October 5, 2004.**

Mr. Harrison presented the minutes from the October 5, 2004, Workforce Board meeting.

### **Motion 04-100-01**

Ms. Beth Thew moved and Mr. John McGinnis seconded that the Workforce Board minutes of October 5, 2004, be approved as presented. The motion passed.

Mr. Harrison then discussed a meeting that he and Ms. O'Brien Saunders had with Representative Phyllis Kenney. She is concerned about the performance of the 12 Workforce Development Councils (WDC) and what more the system can do. We will talk with her again and work to answer her specific questions. Mr. Hudson, Mr. Asbury Lockett, and Ms. Julianne Hanner along with Mr. Harrison met with the WDC Chairs to pitch more involvement, funding for Skill Panels and Job Skills Programs at the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges. We are looking for unconditional approval from the Chairs. Mr. Hudson noted that we are getting a little closer and the attitudes have improved. He thanked Mr. Harrison for his commitment.

Mr. Harrison discussed long term funding for employer tax credits. Mr. Hudson stated that an email was sent to stakeholders to weigh in on the funding of incumbent worker training. Ms. O'Brien Saunders stated that Mr. Bryan Wilson had worked on a bill in 1988 that included good ideas. Mr. Harrison is to facilitate a discussion being held at Association of Washington Business on December 16, 2004, on this same topic.

Mr. Harrison declared that the issues for the draft legislative agenda will take some strategy. Ms. O'Brien Saunders noted that the list reflects the issues the agency is supporting. There is still discussion to be done. Mr. Harrison added that this discussion would include other partnering agencies. Ms. Thew requested that the WDC Chairs and Directors be encouraged to contact their local legislative representatives. Mr. Harrison stated that he and Ms. Madeleine Thompson testified to the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) meeting. The HECB kept them busy for over 40 minutes with questions. Mr. Harrison acknowledged that a special joint meeting with HECB following our regular January board meeting is in the works. Ms. O'Brien Saunders commented on the political uncertainty and the potential shortfall in the budget. Two visible issues are the drop out initiative and WASL, and community and technical college capacity. Ms. Kyra Kester added guidance is a big issue.

### ***High Skills, High Wages: Increasing Engagement in the State Plan***

Ms. O'Brien Saunders introduced this topic by informing the Board on the amount of resources put into *High Skills, High Wages*. She noted the importance of follow through on our commitments. Ms. Madeleine Thompson stated that it's not just about words or a product but how we put it to use. Some legislators have already read *High Skills, High Wages* and are impressed. Ms. Thompson commented that we need to promote the agenda and educate the Board and community. The Board discussed the draft *Annual Report to the Legislature*. Ms. O'Brien Saunders commented on the benchmarks, the measures for key outcomes. Ms. Kester added that it is a useful vehicle for the Legislature. Mr. Harrison asked Mr. Jerry Otis his opinion of the publication. Mr. Otis, a retired carpenter, stated there is a lot of information, but he would change the colors for better readability. Ms. O'Brien Saunders reminded the Board that this is an annual snapshot of the system. Mr. Asbury Lockett added that he did not feel he was informed throughout the year. Ms. O'Brien Saunders suggested that updates could be provided during meetings to help and Mr. Crabbe suggested highlighted agenda items, when relevant to *High Skills, High Wages*.

### **TANF/WorkFirst Overview**

Ms. Deb Bingaman, DSHS, Ms. Jennifer Thornton, SBCTC, Sandy Miller, ESD, and Carmen Gutierrez-Cook, DSHS offered an overview of TANF and WorkFirst systems to the Board. The group shared their agencies' roles in the system of WorkFirst financing and client base. Ms. O'Brien Saunders inquired about the funding breakdown between customized job skills and technical training. Ms. Hanner questioned the minimum wage jobs and how they fit into the wage progression. Mr. Harrison noted that the January meeting could include time for more in depth discussion of the issue.

### **WIA Title I-B Performance Results on the State and Federal Core Indicators**

Mr. Carl Wolfhagen presented analysis to the Board on the Workforce Investment Act Title I results. He stated that we have to meet over 100 percent in each of the four categories to be eligible for an incentive. Mr. Harrison asked whether we could negotiate with the federal government. Ms. O'Brien Saunders noted that table #2, shows how few people we help. Mr. Harrison wanted to know what we could do to make sure these results are upheld.

## **WorkSource Tour**

The Board and guests are given a tour of the WorkSource Renton facility by director, Nancy Loverin.

## **High School Graduation and Dropouts**

Mr. Wes Pruitt presents a summary of the current status of the dropout prevention and retrieval initiative and the state policy on high school graduation. The summary includes three key issues needing resolution by the Board. Mr. Harrison inquired as to what could be put in as an incentive. Ms. Kester noted that guidance initiative was value added. Ms O'Brien Saunders stated the power of recognition is always compelling. Ms. Kester mentioned private awards such as the Milliken awards, are prestigious. Mr. Jim Crabbe noted that there are broader retention problems, not just in high school. Mr. Harrison asked if staff could produced a retention report to identify the problems. Mr. John McGinnis stated that the reward for the system, the school, the teacher, and the teacher's union is job security. Ms. Kester added that class size is a disincentive. Mr. McGinnis noted that the teachers and parents should be involved. Ms. Kester commented that the value of the high school graduation is not clear enough for some students who often have other issues to be considered..

### **Motion 04-100-02**

Mr. Asbury Lockett moved to pass the resolution establishing a Board position on the identified graduation and dropout issues. Ms. Julianne Hanner seconded. The motion passed.

## **One-Stop Labor Market Information (LMI) Plan**

Ms. O'Brien Saunders introduced Mr. Greg Weeks and Mr. Ivars Graudins, Employment Security Department. Mr. Weeks updated the Board on the new requirements for the state labor market information plan. The plan must be co-signed off by the chair of the state Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board.. Mr. Weeks noted that big steps have been taken to work together and will continue in greater extent. We must agree to have more conversations that turn data into information for our customers. Mr. Harrison inquired on whether there are enough local labor market economists to cover all the Workforce Development Council areas. Mr. Weeks mentioned that they had been working with the census bureau to match employment data with gender and age. Mr. Jim Crabbe wanted to know if all the customers were being reached and that there is a need to localize the data. Ms. O'Brien Saunders noted that the information isn't any good if its not used. Mr. Harrison stated that the US Department of Labor asked for our blessing. We as a Board need to talk to our partners and look at the specific needs of our grantees. This is an agenda item for the Interagency Committee.

### **Motion 04-100-03**

Mr. Mike Hudson moved to adopt the recommended motion. Mr. Jim Crabbe seconded. The motion passed.

## **Integrated Performance Information Project**

Ms. Ellen O'Brien Saunders offered a PowerPoint presentation of the Integrated Performance Information Project. Washington State has been asked to lead a nation-wide effort among the states to design the next generation performance management system for workforce development programs. Workforce Board staff has organized policy and technical teams with representation of a cross section of Washington's workforce development programs, and identified five other states to take part in the first phase of the project. The other states are Oregon, Florida, Texas, Michigan, and Montana. A blueprint has been developed to guide the states on creating and maintaining IPI standards. Mr. Crabbe complimented the work done by the members. Mr. Hudson noted the of common sense approach of the project.

The meeting adjourned at 2:42 p.m.

Ellen O'Brien Saunders, Secretary

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Ellen O'Brien Saunders". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Interagency Committee  
Meeting Notes for January 7, 2005

Attending: Debbie Cook (DSB); Kyra Kester (OSPI); Holly Zanville (HECB); Gary Kamimura (ESD); Michelle Andreas, (SBCTC); Ginger Rich (CTED); Elizabeth Smith (L&I); Randy Loomans (WSLC); John Loyle (Pacific Mountain WDC); Gena Wikstrom (Federation of Private Career Schools and Colleges); Ellen O'Brien Saunders, Bryan Wilson, and Pam Lund (Workforce Board).

**Draft January 27, 2005, Workforce Board Meeting Agenda**

Ellen discussed the draft agenda for the January 27, 2005, Workforce Board meeting and the group discussed selected items:

- Federal legislation changes – will look at process, not substantive issues, at this meeting.
- IPI Blueprint – will ask the Board to endorse the promotion of the Blueprint at the national level.
- Workforce Development Council Strategic Plan updates – beginning the process for reviewing and approval local strategic plans.
- Customer Satisfaction Measures – Mehrnaz Jamzadeh of the Workforce Board staff has been working with WorkSource Centers on improving customer satisfaction scores among the federally required performance measures for the Workforce Investment Act. She is analyzing the scores to look for the possible relationships between the types of services received by employers and their level of satisfaction with the goal of improving customer satisfaction.
- Health Care Personnel Shortages Task Force update.

**Joint Meeting of Workforce Board and Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB)**

Following the regular Workforce Board meeting on January 27, the Board will participate in a joint meeting with the HECB.

**Agency and Partner Organization Legislative Priorities**

Agencies and partner organizations shared a brief recap of their 2005 legislative priorities.

**Workforce Development System Assessment Measure**

Staff discussed modification of the current system assessment process with the IC. The intent is to make the measure more meaningful to the survey participants. Debbie Cook noted that the current survey may be hard for people to complete because “you know what you know” and we are asking for assessments of things people don’t know. Discussion centered what are the desired outcomes that are shared among programs. Ellen suggested that focus groups could be created to address this and discover what mutual self interest there may be among programs.

Tab 2



**WASHINGTON STATE  
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD  
MEETING NO. 101  
JANUARY 27, 2005**

**REAUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL ACTS  
PROCESS FOR WORKFORCE BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS**

This year Congress will likely reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act. State statutes direct that the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board):

Upon the enactment of new federal initiatives relating to workforce development, the board shall advise the governor and the legislature on mechanisms for integrating the federal initiatives into the state's workforce development system and make recommendations on the legislative or administrative measures necessary to streamline and coordinate state efforts to meet federal guidelines. (RCW 28C.18.050(4))

The purpose of the Recommended Motion is to identify the general process the Workforce Board will follow in order to advise the Governor and the Legislature on state actions in response to federal reauthorization.

**Board Action Requested:** Adoption of the Recommended Motion

## **RECOMMENDED MOTION**

**WHEREAS**, In 2005, Congress is expected to reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act and the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act; and

**WHEREAS**, State statutes direct the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board to advise the Governor and Legislature on state actions responding to federal workforce development initiatives; and

**WHEREAS**, The Board desires to offer advice that is well informed and supported as broadly as possible by the workforce development community, and that will benefit the customers of the workforce development system;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT**, The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board directs its staff to develop and begin, when appropriate, a process to develop recommendations for the Board's consideration regarding state actions in response to the reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act. Staff should:

Involve state and local stakeholders, including but not limited to affected state and local agencies, representatives of business, representatives of labor, Workforce Development Councils and their staff, and local elected officials;

Include the Board's Interagency Committee and the Performance Management for Continuous Improvement Workgroup;

Communicate frequently with the Office of the Governor and key Legislators and their staff in order to keep them abreast of the process and to obtain feedback on possible recommendations; and

Seek to arrive at consensus recommendations wherever possible.

In response to federal reauthorization of Perkins, the Board directs its staff to develop and begin, when appropriate, a process that is similar to the above, but focuses on the involvement of the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, community and technical colleges, secondary schools and vocational skills centers, and career and technical education associations.

Should either Act be reauthorized during 2005, staff should present recommendations to the Board in time for the Board to advise the Governor and Legislature prior to the start of the 2006 legislative session.

Tab 3

**WASHINGTON STATE  
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD  
MEETING NO. 101  
JANUARY 27, 2005**

**INTEGRATED PERFORMANCE INFORMATION PROJECT**

As discussed at the last Board meeting, at the request of the Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) staff have been leading the national Integrated Performance Information (IPI) Project. The purpose of the project is to assist states and DOL to design the next generation performance management system for workforce development programs. The major document will be a "Blueprint" guide to states.

Since the last Board meeting, Workforce Board staff and Mike Hudson, Association of Washington Business, met with various stakeholders in Washington, D.C., in order to obtain more input on the draft "Blueprint." Attending the meetings were representatives of business, labor, workforce investment boards, secondary and postsecondary education, advocacy organizations for low-income people, adult education, vocational rehabilitation, and others. Staff also met with team leaders from the other 5 IPI states in order to discuss the feedback from various meetings, including the 2 IPI Institutes attended by interagency teams from 10 other states. We are now in the process of writing the final draft "Blueprint." A communication firm will turn the final draft into a publication, and produce shorter materials for broad dissemination.

The original IPI states, and other states and organizations, very much want Congress to learn from the IPI Project. As Congress reauthorizes federal acts related to workforce development, there is a golden opportunity to make revisions in performance accountability requirements so there is a more rational system of performance accountability across programs. Initial conversations with relevant Senate staff indicate interest in incorporating recommendations from the IPI Project.

The purpose of the Recommended Motion is to demonstrate Board support for staff continuing these conversations at the national level. The latest draft of the IPI Executive Summary is included in this tab.

**Board Action Requested:** Adoption of the Recommended Motion

## **RECOMMENDED MOTION**

**WHEREAS,** The Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor requested that the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board lead a national effort among the states to design the next generation performance management system for workforce development, known as the Integrated Performance Information Project; and

**WHEREAS,** Workforce Board staff have led a year long deliberative process among the states that are national leaders in the field of workforce development performance management; and

**WHEREAS,** Washington and other states' staff have reached out broadly to other states; business, labor, and advocacy organizations; program representatives; and the research community in order to obtain input; and

**WHEREAS,** This process has resulted in widely supported recommendations, including recommendations for performance measures that are meaningful across workforce development programs; and

**WHEREAS,** Congress is expected to act in 2005 on reauthorizing the Workforce Investment Act, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act, and perhaps other workforce development related legislation; and

**WHEREAS,** This presents an opportunity to revise the performance accountability sections of these acts in order to establish a more rational system of performance accountability for workforce development.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT,** The Workforce Board supports broad promotion of the recommendations of the Integrated Performance Information Project to other federal agencies and Congress.

# **Integrated Performance Information for Workforce Development A Blueprint for States**

## **Executive Summary**

### **Introduction**

This is a guide for states interested in creating or further developing integrated performance information for workforce development programs. Integrated performance information reports performance results consistently across programs, across levels (from institutions to local areas to states), or for programs as a system. It responds to the longstanding challenge and frustration caused by multiple, inconsistent performance measures across workforce development programs, a multiplicity that impedes collaboration—in both planning and service delivery—and befuddles policy makers. It also responds to shortcomings in programs' management information systems that cannot follow participants over time or report performance in a consistent manner.

Integrated performance information, however, is more than a shared information system and a set of consistent measures. It also requires institutions and practices that support shared accountability for results. The blueprint discusses each of the steps involved: establishing authority, building a culture of shared accountability and trust, generating capacity, crafting performance measures, setting and using targets, as well as creating and maintaining a shared information system.

Some states are at the initial stage of considering whether they want integrated performance information; others may have been at it for a long time, but are interested in improving their work. In either case, the blueprint is intended to be of assistance. States may want to consider bits and pieces, or the whole thing, as best suits their needs.

### **The Need**

There are many advantages to states having integrated performance information. They include increased accountability, improved strategic planning, better research, more efficient use of resources, and a sense of shared responsibility among workforce development programs. These advantages can improve the credibility of workforce programs and, in turn, enhance the support they receive and, ultimately their ability to serve customers.

What is meant by workforce development? The phrase encompasses programs that prepare people for employment and career advancement throughout their lives, and include, but are not limited to:

- Secondary Career and Technical Education
- Postsecondary Career and Technical Education
- The Employment Service, Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Title III
- WIA Title I-B
- Trade Adjustment Assistance Act
- Adult Education and Family Literacy, WIA Title II
- Vocational Rehabilitation, WIA Title IV
- Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Work Program
- Apprenticeship

Viewed as a system, it may surprise some to learn that most money for these programs comes from the states. The largest programs, in terms of funding, are the education programs for which states typically supply at least 90 percent of the funds. Given this funding arrangement, it is logical that states exercise leadership in devising integrated performance information across workforce development programs.

The U.S. Office of Management and the Budget (OMB) has taken an important initial step toward integrated performance information by issuing "common measures" for federal workforce development programs. OMB has gotten the attention of federal agencies, particularly the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), regarding the need for consistent measures across programs. DOL has also taken the step of designing a new reporting system, Employment and Training Administration (ETA) Management Information and Longitudinal Evaluation System (EMILE), that is to be consistent across most DOL programs. The blueprint builds on these initial steps by recommending performance measures and an information system that would support consistency across state as well as federal workforce programs. Using the Blueprint does not, however, require implementation of EMILE.

The Blueprint was produced through the joint efforts of six states (Florida, Michigan, Montana, Oregon, Texas, and Washington), with the financial support of DOL. Washington State's Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board), with the assistance of the National Governors Association's (NGA) Center for Best Practices convened policy and technical teams from each of the six states. Each state team included representation from a cross-section of workforce development programs. This diversity of representation was a necessary ingredient for the success of the project. The team members endeavored to listen closely to the perspectives of each program and to arrive at solutions that were acceptable to all (Appendix A lists participants).

The state teams met several times during 2004 to share experiences and lessons learned, review technical papers, think through key questions, and arrive at a consensus on key aspects of integrated performance information. In addition to the NGA's Center for Best Practices, the states received assistance from the Ray Marshall Center at the University of Texas and the Center for Governmental Studies at Northern Illinois University. The states benefited greatly from the research conducted on behalf of the project as well as from the general expertise and experience of these entities. They and the state teams provided much of the material for the Blueprint and reviewed and commented on drafts. The Blueprint is very much the shared product of the six states and their partners, although the Workforce Board remains ultimately responsible.

The Blueprint consists of the following sections:

## **Part I: Challenges and Responses**

States face serious challenges as they embark down the road of creating integrated performance information. And the challenges don't end with the beginning. Most of the challenges are ongoing and require constant attention. This section of the Blueprint examines some of the major challenges and choices that some states have made to address them. The section discusses: (1) establishing authority for integrated performance information, (2) creating a culture of shared accountability, (3) building capacity—including funding and addressing privacy issues, and (4) reaching consensus on goals and measures. For each challenge, the Blueprint presents examples of actions states have taken, the variety of actions reflecting the institutional structures, and political conditions in states. States reading the Blueprint may want to pick and choose from these examples and implement the steps that best fit their situation.

## **Part II: IPI Performance Measures**

What are the best performance measures for workforce development if the same measures are applied horizontally and vertically within the system, including programs that are funded mostly by the states and programs that are funded mostly by Congress? This was a central question considered by the six states and their partners at NGA's Center for Best Practices and the Ray Marshall Center at the University of Texas.

The states began by considering, "What do policy leaders want to know about performance results?" They then suggested the selection criteria for judging measures, and analyzed the advantages and disadvantages of a long list of possible measures. In the end, the states agreed on a relatively short list of measures that best respond to the performance questions commonly posed by policy leaders. This section of the Blueprint summarizes the discussion and recommendations of the six states' teams. Other states may wish to follow suit, either by following this type of process within their state, or by adopting some or all of the recommended measures.

The following table summarizes the performance measures recommended by the teams from the six states. The measures are separated into those measures that are useful as accountability measures, for which there could be targets and consequences, and those measures that, while indicators of how well the workforce development system is doing, do not sufficiently satisfy the criteria for good performance measures in order to be used for targets and consequences.



## IPI Performance Measures

Category	Measure
<b>Accountability Measures</b>	
<b>Labor Market Results for Program Participants</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Do people get jobs?</li> <li>❖ What do they earn?</li> </ul>	<p><b>1. Short-term Employment Rate:</b> The percentage of participants who are employed during the second quarter after exit. (For youth, enrollment in education counts as well as employment.)</p> <p><b>2. Long-term Employment Rate:</b> The percentage of participants that have exited who are employed during the fourth quarter after exit. (For youth, enrollment in education counts as well as employment.)</p> <p><b>3. Earnings Level:</b> Median earnings during the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter after exit among all exiters with earnings.</p>
<b>Skill Gains</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Do people gain skills?</li> </ul>	<p><b>4. Credential Completion Rate:</b> The percentage of exiters who have completed a certificate, degree, diploma, licensure, or other industry-recognized credential within one year of exit.</p>
<b>Results for Employers and the Economy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Do employers benefit?</li> </ul>	<p><b>5. Repeat Employer Customers:</b> The percentage of employers who are served who return to the same program for service within one year.</p>
<b>Performance Indicators</b>	
<b>Results for Employers and the Economy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Do employers benefit?</li> </ul>	<p><b>6. Employer Market Penetration:</b> The percentage of all employers who are served during one year.</p>
<b>Return on Investment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Do the programs make a difference?</li> </ul>	<p><b>7. Taxpayer Return on Investment:</b> The net impact on tax revenue and social welfare payments compared to the cost of the services.</p> <p><b>8. Participant Return on Investment:</b> The net impact on participant earnings and employer-provided benefits compared to the cost of the services.</p>

The state teams considered many other measures beside these eight. This section discusses some of these measures and why they did not rise to the top of the list. This section also discusses data sources, setting and using performance targets, adjusting targets or results for economic conditions and participant characteristics, and how national research complements state performance measurement.

### **Part III: Shared Information Systems**

A major barrier to integrated performance information is the absence of a shared or integrated information system for workforce development in most states. Participant information remains scattered about in various program level Management Information Systems (MISs), and there is usually no system for integrating the information from the multiple MISs to support cross-program performance measurement and reporting.

This section of the Blueprint discusses the steps and decisions involved in establishing a “data warehouse” that links administrative records from multiple programs with other data sets containing outcome information, such as unemployment insurance wage records. A data warehouse is built on top of exiting MISs and does not replace them. The MISs are still necessary for program management. The warehouse is a longer term repository where data are cleaned and matched in order to analyze and report performance outcomes and to conduct research.

Creating a data warehouse requires states to make decisions regarding: authorization; leadership; funding; scope; data ownership, confidentiality, and access; information flows; reporting; and quality assurance, among other issues. This section of the Blueprint walks through each of these issues and the major options.

### **Conclusion**

States will want to consider how to use the blueprint given federal initiatives in this area, including the OMB’s common measures, the DOL’s EMILE System, and the pending reauthorization of WIA, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, and other federal acts related to workforce development. States may choose to proceed in a number of different ways. The development of a shared information system is something that should be useful no matter the outcomes of the federal initiatives. Electronically linking records from multiple programs with files containing outcome data will facilitate the implementation of common measures and reporting the performance information likely to be required by the reauthorized acts, as well as meeting state-identified needs.

If states find some or all of the performance measures recommended here to be useful, they can implement them as additional measures to those necessary to satisfy federal or other state requirements. Experience has shown, moreover, that federal performance measurement requirements evolve over time. If states find the IPI measures to be useful in responding to policy makers’ needs, the measures may be reflected in future generations of federal acts and guidelines. Federal performance requirements have a powerful effect on program implementation and results; if states find the IPI measures to be useful, it would be very helpful if future federal requirements were aligned with them.

Finally, no matter the specific course of events in Congress or the federal agencies, the basic issues of building the capacity for and a culture of shared accountability are likely to be challenges that remain with states. Hopefully, the experiences and lessons learned that are shared here will help states as they continue to face these challenges.

Tab 4

**WASHINGTON STATE  
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD  
MEETING NO. 101  
JANUARY 27, 2005**

**UPDATING LOCAL AREA STRATEGIC PLANS  
FOR THE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM**

Executive Order 99-02 directs Washington State Workforce Development Councils (WDCs), in partnership with Chief Local Elected Officials (CLEOs) to develop and maintain a local unified plan. The local unified plan includes:

1. A five-year (currently July 2000 to June 2005) operations plan for Title I-B employment and training programs funded under the Workforce Investment Act.
2. A five-year (currently July 2000 to June 2005) strategic plan for the workforce development system.

The Executive Order also directs that local strategic plans be consistent with the state strategic plan for workforce development.

**Background:**

On July 30, 1999, the Board sent plan development and state approval guidelines to the 12 WDCs and CLEOs requesting that they work with business, labor, program operators, and other workforce development partners to establish a five-year local area unified plan. On June 13, 2000, a committee of the Board, in consultation with the Employment Security Department, recommended that Governor Locke approve the local unified plans.

Following the Board's adoption of the 2002 edition of "High Skills, High Wages," the Board issued new guidelines to the WDCs requesting they update their area's strategic plan so that state and local plans remained aligned. In the summer of 2003, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) completed its review process and recommended that the Governor approve the updated local strategic plans.

As local area strategic plans expire on June 30, 2005, the 12 WDCs have begun organizing local processes to develop a new two-year plan (July 1, 2005, through June 30, 2007).

In the meantime, the Workforce Board has issued "High Skills, High Wages 2004" which focuses attention on six strategic opportunities.

This tab has Workforce Board draft guidelines laying out content elements for the 2005-07 local area strategic plan and the Board's approval process and schedule.

**Board Action Required:** Adoption of the recommended motion.

## **RECOMMENDED MOTION**

**WHEREAS**, Executive Order 99-02 directs the Workforce Development Councils, in partnership with Chief Local Elected Officials, to develop and maintain a strategic plan that assesses local employment opportunities and skill needs; the present and future workforce; the current workforce development system; and goals, objectives, and strategies for the local workforce development system; and

**WHEREAS**, Local Area Strategic Plans for Workforce Development will expire on June 30, 2005; and

**WHEREAS**, The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, on behalf of the Governor, is responsible for issuing state guidelines to the Chief Local Elected Officials and to the Workforce Development Councils on developing the local area strategic plan for Workforce Development; and

**WHEREAS**, The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, on June 30, 2004, adopted *High Skills, High Wages 2004: Washington's Strategic Plan for Workforce Development*; and

**WHEREAS**, The process for creating the 2005-07 strategic plans presents an opportunity for Workforce Development Councils and their partners to identify contemporary goals, objectives and strategies that are consistent with the state's 2004 strategic plan; and

**WHEREAS**, Executive Order 99-02 directs the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board to:

“Review the plans of local workforce development councils for consistency with the state unified plan and recommend to the to the Governor whether or not local plans should be approved.”

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT**, The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board approve the recommended guidelines outlined under this tab.

**Draft Guidelines  
for Developing the 2005-07 Local Strategic Plan  
for the Workforce Development System**

**Overall Goals for July 2005-June 2007 Local Area Strategic Plan**

- A. To articulate a vision for the local area's workforce development system.
- B. To develop goals, objectives, and strategies to increase skill levels, employment, earnings, productivity, customer satisfaction and return on workforce development investments, and to reduce poverty in the area.
- C. To reach agreement on a blueprint to utilize the area's strategic workforce assets to meet the requirements of the changing economy.
- D. To create a planning process, facilitated by the Workforce Development Council (WDC), that assures meaningful opportunities for business, labor, Chief Local Elected Officials (CLEOs), program operators, WorkSource partner agencies, and others to communicate their needs, offer their perspectives and expertise, and participate in the process. The review and comment process for developing the local strategic plan is dynamic, with opportunities for interested parties to comment as the plan is built.
- E. To create/update a plan that is consistent with *High Skills, High Wages 2004: Washington's Strategic Plan for Workforce Development* and is focused on the unique needs and resources of the local area. While developing the 2005-07 plan, WDCs should give special attention to the six *Strategic Opportunities for the Next Two Years* (see "High Skills, High Wages 2004" pages 73-75).
- F. To broadly share goals, objectives, and strategies that:
  - Represent the priorities of the WDC and its partners.
  - Reflect stakeholder inputs.
  - Offer guidance and propose approaches that will clearly benefit the customers of the workforce development system (employers, jobseekers, workers, and students).
  - Are supported by current and specific economic and demographic data and needs assessment.
  - Take into account existing workforce development programs and services.
  - Are informed by program performance.

## **How is “Local Workforce Development System” Described?**

The “Workforce Development System” means programs that use private and/or public (local, state, and federal) funds to prepare workers for employment, upgrade worker skills, retrain workers, or provide employment or retention services for workers or employers.

The “Workforce Development System” includes, but is not limited to:

- Secondary vocational education, including activities funded under the federal Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act of 1998.
- Community and technical college vocational education programs, including activities funded under the federal Carl D. Perkins Vocational-Technical Education Act of 1998.
- Private career schools and private college vocational programs.
- Employer-sponsored training.
- Youth, adult, and dislocated worker programs funded by Title I-B of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) of 1998.
- Work-related adult basic education and literacy programs, including programs funded under the federal Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (WIA Title II).
- Activities funded under the federal Wagner-Peyser Act (WIA Title III).
- Apprenticeships.
- The One-Stop System [as described in WIA Sec.121(b)].
- The state Job Skills Program.
- Training Benefits Program.
- Work-related components of the vocational rehabilitation program (WIA Title IV).
- Services provided by the Department of Services for the Blind.
- Programs offered by private and public nonprofit organizations that provide job training or work-related adult literacy services.
- May include other local, state, and federally funded workforce development programs.
- May include other privately funded workforce development programs and initiatives.

## **2005-07 Local Area Strategic Plan – Content Sections**

### **Tomorrow’s Economy**

The plan includes a section that assesses the local area economy, its future course, and the market-driven skills it will demand. Occupations with a shortage of skilled workers and industries that are key to the area’s economic vitality are identified. The assessment data in this section supports and forms the basis of the goals, objectives, and strategies identified for the local area’s workforce development system. This section also includes an analysis of local area economic development strategies and describes how workforce development strategies are linked to economic development strategies.



## **Changing Workforce in the Workforce Development Area**

The plan includes an assessment of the current and future workforce in the local area. The information in this section answers questions such as:

- What are the demographic characteristics of the current workforce?
- What are the educational and literacy levels?
- How are the area's demographics changing?
- What are the in-migration and out-migration issues?
- What is the demographic picture for the youth, adults in transition (job seekers, dislocated workers), and incumbent workers?
- What are the special needs of individuals with barriers to employment?
- What are the planning implications for the demographic profile expected of the area's workforce of tomorrow?

The assessment provides convincing background information that supports, and is the basis for, the goals, objectives, and strategies in the 2005-07 plan.

## **Workforce Development System Today**

The plan includes a section describing the workforce development system in the local area. The information in this section answers questions such as:

- How does each program's role fit into the area's workforce development system?
- How does the local area's workforce development system serve youth, adults in transition, incumbent workers, apprentices?
- What are the public and private workforce initiatives underway?

The information offers community leaders a current picture of the programs in the area's workforce development system. The information offers background and reasoning for 2005-07 workforce development strategies outlined in the plan.

## **Performance Accountability**

The plan includes a section that updates information on performance accountability for the local area's workforce development system including the adjusted levels of performance for WIA Title I-B programs for the most recent program years. The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) will supply the WDCs with available system performance information.

Overall goals for the performance accountability section of the plan:

1. To use performance information on workforce development programs to inform local strategic planning.
2. To use performance information to oversee WorkSource and WIA Title I-B. The WDC will ensure that necessary data are collected and maintained for performance accountability for WorkSource and WIA Title I-B following state and Department of Labor protocols.
3. To ensure that program performance on WorkSource and WIA Title I-B is used by program operators to inform continuous quality improvement in day-to-day management.

4. To update information on performance-based intervention. The WDC will be held accountable for the results of WIA Title I-B through a system of performance-based interventions, and will share in accountability for vocational education and adult education results through a system of incentives (Sec. 503 performance incentives).

### **Agenda for Action**

The 2005-07 strategic plan presents the local area's vision, goals, objectives, and strategies for the workforce development system. The plan identifies strategies that address regional specific workforce development needs.

The plan is aligned with *High Skills, High Wages 2004: Washington's Strategic Plan for Workforce Development*. It emerges from collaboration with workforce development stakeholders across the region and responds to six strategic opportunities listed on pages 73-75 of "High Skills, High Wages 2004."

There are 15 strategies in "High Skills, High Wages 2004" where WDCs have a lead implementation role. The local strategic plan should specifically address these 15 strategies.

### **Plan Update Format**

WDCs may choose their own publication styles, content organization, and formats in developing their area's 2005-07 strategic plan.

### **Timeline**

January 6, 2005	Draft guidelines reviewed by WDC Directors at its Workforce Washington Association meeting.
January 27, 2005	Workforce Board adopts local area strategic plan guidelines.
February 2005	Guidelines sent to the WDCs. The cover letter will formally notify the WDCs that the duration of their area's current strategic plan is extended to September 21, 2005.
June 30, 2005	Target date to submit draft plans to the Workforce Board for Workforce Board staff review and comment.
August 19, 2005	By this date the WDCs, in coordination with CLEOs, adopt their area plan and final plan is submitted to the Workforce Board.
September 21, 2005	Workforce Board meets. The Workforce Board adopts a resolution recommending Governor approval of local area strategic plans.
October 2005	Governor takes action on local strategic plans.

## **Public Input for the 2005-07 Strategic Plan**

The public review and comment period on the draft plan should extend for a minimum of 45 calendar days. The public review design and process is a local choice. A list of the WDC's strategic planning team(s) and a description of the public review and comment process should be included in the plan or in the plan's appendix.

## **Plan Approval**

The Workforce Board plan approval process will be open and inclusive. Workforce Board staff will keep the Board informed of the WDCs' plan development progress. Workforce Board staff will review local area draft plans as they are available and will offer comment on any missed opportunities for state and local plan alignment or connection with other state initiatives that could advance the local area's goals.. If Workforce Board staff and the staff of a WDC disagree regarding state and local plan alignment and are unable to reach agreement, the review of the local plan will be elevated to the Board level.

# Tab 5

**WASHINGTON STATE  
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD  
MEETING NO. 101  
JANUARY 27, 2005**

**EMPLOYER CUSTOMER SATISFACTION RESULTS  
AS A TOOL FOR IMPROVEMENT**

**Introduction**

There are two measures of customer satisfaction among the federally required performance measures for the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). These are based on employer and participant survey responses to three required satisfaction questions (attached). For employer satisfaction, WIA Title I and the Employment Service (WIA Title III) use the same measure and results. Respondents evaluate the services they receive on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 indicating the greatest degree of satisfaction. The score, from the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ASCI), is based on an average of the responses to the three questions, with the average converted to a score between 0 and 100.

In Washington's most recent annual report on WIA Title I performance, the state barely met its target for customer satisfaction (68.0 for employers and 74.8 for participants). The results are less than one-tenth of a percentage point above the target agreed to by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). Next year, the target for employer satisfaction is one point higher. In order to increase our results, Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) staff is analyzing the ASCI scores, beginning with employer satisfaction, to identify possible areas for improvement.

**Analysis**

The purpose of the analysis is to identify possible relationships between the types of services received by employers and their level of satisfaction. For each type of service, the chart on the following page shows the number of employers who responded that they received the service and the average ASCI score among those reporting receiving the service. The services are listed in order of their ASCI customer satisfaction score. A total of 6,568 employers were in the survey sample. They received services between July 1, 2002, to June 30, 2004.

The results show that more intensive services tend to be associated with higher ACSI scores. The services associated with the highest scores are: presentations to laid-off workers, customized training, labor market information, other help with lay-offs, and tax credit information. Relatively few employers, however, received these services. By increasing the percentage of employers who do receive them, the overall ACSI score should increase. (Services regarding lay-offs, of course, are dependent on the prevalence of lay-offs.)

Customized training, for example, is associated with a relatively high ACSI score; however, only 3 percent of employers reported receiving such service. The availability of customized training through WIA is currently limited to WIA 10 percent funds. There is language in the WIA bills before Congress that open up the use of local Title I formula funds to customized training. If this occurs, it would increase employer satisfaction. The 2005 state legislature will also be considering increasing the availability of state support for customized training.

### Employer Customer Service Responses July 2002 – June 2004

Type of Service	Number of Employers Responding, "Yes" Received Service	Number of Employers Responding, "No" Did Not Receive Service	Percentage of Respondents who Received the Service	Average ACSI Score Among Employers who Received the Service
Presentations to Laid-off Workers	100	3,775	2%	79.5
Customized Training	164	4,299	3%	79.0
Labor Market Information-Employment Trends	638	3,761	13%	78.4
Lay-off Help	124	4,353	3%	77.8
Tax Credit Info.	645	3,727	14%	77
On-the-Job Training	291	4,119	6%	75.7
Screen Applicant	2,429	1,479	51%	72.8
Referral	4,117	395	86%	69.6
Post Job Opening	4,446	212	93%	68.5

Employers who receive screened job applicants have an average ACSI score that is 3.2 points higher than employers who receive referrals. While this may not seem like much of a difference, this factor alone could ensure that Washington meets its future performance targets for customer satisfaction. Only 55 percent of employers receiving referrals report receiving job applicants who have been screened. There may be room to increase the availability of this service.

Another service sometimes provided through WorkSource centers, although not shown in this chart, is the occasional use of space and office equipment by employers. Only 15 percent of employers responding to the survey indicated they have used this service. Their average ACSI

score is 74.1. **Making** this more widely available may be another opportunity to **increase** customer satisfaction.

If the relatively **low** numbers of employers receiving services associated with **higher** ACSI scores is due to **lack** of knowledge, then the overall score might be raised by **increased marketing** activities.

### **Conclusion**

Workforce Board staff will continue to analyze the employer satisfaction results in more detail, and the participant satisfaction results as well. All of this information is being shared with **state** and local WorkSource staff so that they may use the information to improve customer service.

## ATTACHMENT

### Three ACSI Questions

Q13. Utilizing a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 means Very Dissatisfied and 10 means Very Satisfied, what is your overall satisfaction with the services provided from a Washington State WorkSource Office or Workforce Development Program? (ENTER NUMBER 1-10)

---

Q14. Considering all of the expectations you may have had about the services, to what extent have the services met your expectations? Now 1 means Falls Short of My Expectations and 10 means Exceeds my Expectations. (ENTER NUMBER 1-10)

---

Q15. Now think of the ideal service or services for a company in your circumstances. How well do you think the service or services you received compare with the ideal service or services? Now 1 means Not Very Close to the Ideal and 10 means Very Close to the Ideal.

---



Tab 6

**WASHINGTON STATE  
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD  
MEETING NO. 101  
JANUARY 27, 2005**

**REPORT OF THE HEALTH CARE PERSONNEL SHORTAGE TASK FORCE**

**Task Force Progress Report**

At the meeting, staff will brief the Board on *Progress 2004: Annual Report of the Health Care Personnel Shortage Task Force*. The Executive Summary and a PowerPoint presentation of the report are included in this tab.

During 2004, the Task Force formed three committees to examine common core curricula in allied health programs; and recruitment and retention of faculty for allied health and nursing programs. The full Task Force met in July and October. They adopted committee recommendations and heard presentations from workforce partners who are implementing strategies in the state plan. Legislation passed in 2003 requires the Task Force to provide an annual progress report.

**Why Was the Task Force Established?**

Industry representatives approached the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board) in 2001 to request that it convene stakeholders to examine the emerging shortage of health care personnel. Following recommendations of a work group of stakeholders convened by the Workforce Board, four legislative leaders requested that the Board convene a formal task force to address shortages of health care personnel in Washington. The Workforce Board convened the Health Care Personnel Shortage Task Force, comprised of representatives of business, labor, professional associations, and government. The January 2003 report: "*Crisis or Opportunity?*" outlined the key issues and established a state strategic plan for addressing shortages. The first annual report of the Task Force was *Progress 2003*.

**Board Action Required:** None. For informational purposes only.

## Executive Summary

Since the Health Care Personnel Shortage Task Force (Task Force) submitted its action plan, *Health Care Personnel Shortages: Crisis or Opportunity?* to the Legislature in January 2003, significant progress has been made to reduce shortages of health care personnel in Washington. At least 2,000 additional students have entered health care education programs, and ongoing capacity in health care education has expanded by 559 full-time equivalent (FTE) students.

Despite these advances, employers reported over 8,000 job vacancies for health care practitioners and support personnel in 2004. In addition, the health care needs of Washington's aging population will continue to increase demand for health care personnel through 2020. The Task Force urges the Legislature, secondary and postsecondary educational institutions, local and state health and workforce development organizations, and other partners to recognize that intensive work is still needed over the next several years to catch up with the increasing demand for health care personnel.

During 2004, state and local partners have continued to implement Task Force strategies such as:

- Educational capacity in health care education programs expanded by about 2,000 students during 2003-05, and 559 FTE student slots will be ongoing. About \$10.5 million of the \$27.2 million high-demand funding appropriated by the Legislature, and another \$2.9 million in state appropriated funds was directed toward expanding capacity in health care programs. This is a total of nearly \$13.5 million in state appropriations to expand health care education.
- A \$3 million federal incentive award was directed to expanding capacity in health care programs, and providing K-12 health career exploration and work-based learning. These were instigated by health skill panels

(partnerships of employers, labor, and education and training providers convened by Workforce Development Councils [WDCs]) in conjunction with community and technical colleges.

- Twelve health skill panels covering all areas of the state have initiated expansion of educational capacity, clinical site coordination, incumbent worker training, local financial aid, connections with WorkSource employment services, transitions for military personnel, among numerous other activities (see Appendix C).
- Following the direction of House Bill (HB) 2382, the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC), and the Council of Presidents convened nursing program deans and faculty to develop a statewide direct transfer agreement for nursing and health sciences. This group aims to develop a clear pathway to ensure students do not have to repeat credits and are ready to enter their upper division health care major in nursing or other allied health occupations.
- The Center of Excellence in Allied Health located at Yakima Valley Community College (YVCC) developed and implemented a common core curricula program for medical assisting, medical billing and coding, surgical technology, pharmacy technology, and medical interpreter. The curricula, offered via the Internet, serves as a model for core curriculum development across the state.

### 2005 Priorities

The Task Force recommends the Legislature take immediate action to expand educational capacity in health care programs, recruit and retain health care faculty, and collect data on the supply of health care workers in order to plan for future educational needs. Educational institutions and industry partners should

expand health care programs, support K-12 recruitment, improve articulation and transitions between three tiers of education, and expand use of core curricula.

Expand capacity in health care programs. Expansion of educational capacity in health care programs continues to be the number one priority of the Task Force. Legislative appropriations for the 2003-05 biennium provided much needed funds to expand capacity in health care programs, but these programs are still unable to meet student and employer demand.

- The Legislature should provide funds to expand educational capacity in high-demand health care education and training programs. The funding policy should incentivize educational institutions to provide health care programs, allowing for the higher costs of these programs.
- Educational institutions and industry partners should continue to expand capacity in health care education programs and seek federal and private resources to support this.

Increase the availability and diversity of faculty in health care education programs. One of the main obstacles to increasing educational capacity in health care programs is the difficulty of recruiting and retaining qualified faculty. During 2004, the Task Force convened two committees on nursing and allied health faculty covering recruitment, retention, and diversity issues.<sup>2</sup>

- The Legislature should support budget requests that enable colleges and universities to provide health care faculty salaries that are competitive with industry. Both SBCTC and the four-year schools have requested across the board faculty salary increases. SBCTC has submitted a budget request for \$33.3 million to enable colleges to increase compensation for faculty who

are teaching in high-demand programs, and the Task Force support pertains to health care program faculty and staff.

- As salary increase dollars become available, leaders in four-year educational institutions should increase compensation for faculty in high-demand health care programs in order to compete with industry salaries.
- Educational institutions should replicate successful methods for recruiting and retaining faculty, including programs to increase the diversity of faculty.

Collect data on health workforce supply. Developing an accurate picture of the health workforce is critical to guide the most cost-effective workforce planning and to eliminate health care personnel shortages. Current state data are adequate to indicate broad areas of shortages. More specific information, however, is essential for educational planning so that the state can increase capacity where needed and in order to carry out the Task Force's legislative charge to track progress. It is also critical for forecasting future shortages or surpluses in the health workforce, identifying medically underserved areas, tracking diversity, and assisting with emergency preparedness.

- To initiate and maintain data that will enable the targeting of educational resources to meet health workforce needs, the Task Force requests a state appropriation of \$206,745 (Year 1: Start Up) and \$265,484 (Year 2: Implementation) and ongoing funds of approximately \$175,000 per year.

Provide health career exploration and adequately prepare youth for postsecondary health care programs. The most effective strategy for ensuring youth are exposed to health careers and have the opportunity to prepare adequately is to provide intensive work-based learning and career exposure

combined with academic preparation during middle and high school or even earlier.

- More Washington school districts with high schools should develop health care programs as part of their Health and Human Services Pathway. About half of Washington's high schools currently offer health programs as part of their Health and Human Services Pathway.
- Skill panel employers and other partners should continue to provide work-based learning in health care settings.
- Following the 2004 Task Force website committee recommendations, one community college should establish a health careers website aimed at youth to enable health care exploration and provide information on educational programs and financial aid opportunities. With support from the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board), YVCC's Center of Excellence will establish a statewide website in 2005.

Increase efficiency and effectiveness in health care education and training programs. One strategy for increasing efficiency is to develop and implement common core curricula. YVCC's Center of Excellence in Allied Health has established the Allied Health Core Curriculum.

- The 2004 Task Force core curricula committee examined Yakima's core curriculum and models in other states. The committee recommended that educational institutions work together to expand core curricula use in Washington.

Enable local areas to address their priority shortages. Health skill panels across the 12 workforce development areas have catalyzed many successful initiatives to recruit, educate, and retain health care personnel for employers in their areas. They have initiated recruitment

and preparation of youth, expansion of educational capacity, clinical site coordination, incumbent worker training, local financial aid, connections with WorkSource employment services, transitions for military personnel, and a variety of other essential activities.

- Federal workforce funds have provided support to these panels with matches from local industry and WDCs. A state appropriation to support skill panels would enhance their ability to implement effective solutions to local health workforce needs.

### Conclusion

It is necessary for the Governor, the Legislature, and all health and workforce organizations to maintain and expand efforts to address health care personnel shortages. The health care industry is vital to our economy. Washington hospitals alone contribute \$17.5 billion to the state each year when direct spending and indirect impacts are combined.<sup>3</sup> The industry employs more than 207,000 Washingtonians. It is one sector where demand for jobs is not subject to fluctuations in the economy or outsourcing to other countries except in a few particular occupations. With consistent collaborative work, it will be possible to reduce shortages. This will be critical for ensuring Washington's residents receive the health care services they need.

### What You Will Find in This Progress Report

This progress report provides a brief update on health care personnel shortages, outlines progress during 2004, and explores issues of faculty availability and diversity and core curricula. Appendix A reports progress for each strategy, Appendix B reports outcome measures, Appendix C provides a summary of progress in each workforce development area, Appendix D lists committee members, and finally the Glossary which defines terms and acronyms.



## *References*

<sup>2</sup> Committee membership included faculty and administrators from two-year and four-year public and private institutions, labor, employers, and government representatives (see Appendix D).

<sup>3</sup> William B. Beyers, University of Washington, *The Economic Impact of Hospitals in Washington State in the Year 2001*, July 2003, pg. 2. The report states: "For every direct dollar of spending by hospitals, about \$2.4 in business activity was created in the Washington economy in the year 2001. This business activity created a total of 204,000 jobs, slightly more than three jobs in total created for every hospital industry job."



*Progress 2004:*  
The Annual Report of the Health Care  
Personnel Shortage Task Force

**Board Meeting: January 27, 2005**

**Presenter**

Madeleine Thompson, Policy Analyst

**The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board**

<http://www.wtb.wa>



The Health Care Personnel Shortage  
Task Force

- The Workforce Board convened health care stakeholders to examine the shortages of health care personnel starting in 2001. Following direction from legislative leaders a Task Force was formed in 2002.
- The Task Force published a state plan with 40 strategies and 16 outcome measures in January 2003: **"Crisis or Opportunity?"**
- 2003 Legislation, Engrossed Substitute House Bill (ESHB\_ 1852 requests the Workforce Board to continue to convene stakeholders and **report progress** annually. (Annual Reports: *Progress 2003, Progress 2004*)



## Who is on the Task Force?

- \*Holly Moore, Chair (President - Shoreline Community College)
- \*Bill Gray, Vice Chair (Dean - WSU Spokane)
- \*Washington State Hospital Association
- \*Washington State Nurses Association
- \*Higher Education Coordinating Board
- \*State Board for Community and Technical Colleges
- \*Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
- \*Assoc. of Washington Public Hospital Districts
- \*Workforce Board (WTECB)
- \*Service Employees International Union (Allied Health)
- \*United Food and Commercial Workers Union (Allied Health)
- \*Migrant and Community Health
- \*WA Dental Association
- \*WA State Medical Assoc.
- \*Allied Health
- \*Group Health Cooperative
- \*Department of Health
- \*Rural Health
- \*Long-Term Care
- \*State Board of Health



## "Crisis or Opportunity?" State Plan for Addressing Shortages

### 6 Goals:

1. Increase educational capacity & efficiency in health care education and training programs to enable more people to gain qualifications to work in health care occupations.
2. Recruit more individuals, especially targeted populations into health care occupations, and promote adequate preparation prior to entry.
3. Develop a data collection and analysis system to assess health workforce supply and demand.





## The strategy for creating an adequate supply of health care personnel

### **6 Goals (continued...):**

4. Retain current health care workers.
5. Enable local communities to implement strategies to alleviate the health care personnel shortages in their areas.
6. Develop a mechanism to ensure continued collaboration among stakeholders, track progress, create accountability for fulfilling this plan, and to plan for future health workforce needs.



## Progress Highlights: Funds Appropriated to Expand Capacity

- ✓ For the 2003-05 biennium approximately **\$13.46 million** of state appropriated funds was directed toward expanding capacity in health care educational and training programs.
- ✓ **High Demand** funds appropriated by the Legislature.
- ✓ Workforce development funds.
- ✓ Other state and federal funds.
- ✓ In addition, local health skill panels and their private and public partners have dedicated funds to expanding education and training opportunities.

**Note:** It is estimated that capacity will expand by at least **2,000 FTE's**. About 28 percent (559) of the additional FTE's will form part of the base for future legislative allocations.



## Educational Programs Receiving High-Demand Funding

Baccalaureate Institution / Program	03-05
UW, Bachelors of Science in Nursing (32 FTEs)	\$456,000
WSU, Bachelors of Science in Nursing (98 FTEs)	\$1,652,000
CWU, Safety & Health Management (12 FTEs)	\$168,000
EWU, Doctorate of Physical Therapy (8 FTEs)	\$96,000
EWU, Bachelor of Science Dental Hygiene (14 FTEs)	\$102,000
UW, doctor of Pharmacy (10 FTEs)	\$113,000
WSU, Pharmacy (46 FTEs)	\$929,000
WSU, Pre-Science/Pre-Health Science (30 FTEs)	\$268,130
<b>Total ongoing FTEs = 245</b>	<b>Total \$3,780,000</b>



## Other Funding for Health Care Education

- State Board for Community and Technical Colleges: workforce development, Integrated Basic Education and Skills Training, Worker Retraining, Center of Excellence in Allied Health (Yakima Valley Community College).
- Other federal state and local funds: federal grant programs, state (Employment Security programs for incumbent worker training), and local funding.
- Total hospital support was over \$18 million in 2003.



## Educational Programs Receiving High-Demand Funding

Community and Technical Colleges: Bates, Bellevue, Bellingham (with Skagit/Whatcom), Clover Park with Pierce-Puyallup, Big Bend, Centralia, Clark, Columbia Basin, Everett, Grays Harbor, Lower Columbia, Olympic, Pierce-Ft Steilacoom, Peninsula, Renton, Seattle District, Spokane, Tacoma.

Programs: Associate Degree Nurse, Practical Nurse, Medical Informatics, Dental Hygiene, and other allied health programs.

➤ Total High-Demand Funds 2003-2005: \$3,124,000.

➤ **Total ongoing FTEs: 314.**



## 2004: Other Legislative Highlights

- ✓ Removing barriers to entry: Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6554 eliminates barriers to credentialing for some high-demand occupations, such as registered nurses and dental hygienists.
- ✓ Improving articulation: Substitute House Bill 2382 requires the Higher Education Coordinating Board and two- and four-year institutions to develop transfer associate degrees in specific majors, including nursing.
- ✓ Increasing diversity: Senate Concurrent Resolution 8419 creates a Joint Select Committee on Health Disparities to consider ways to increase people of color in the health care workforce, among other objectives.



## 2003: Legislative Highlights

- ✓ Improving recruitment: Substitute House Bill 1189 allowed hospital districts to reimburse employees for education and training, and for travel to interviews.
- ✓ Improving recruitment: Substitute Senate Bill 5966 reduced barriers for dentists from other states to practice in Washington.
- ✓ Monitoring progress: Engrossed Substitute House Bill 1852 required the Workforce Board to continue to convene health care workforce stakeholders, and report progress annually.



## Numerous Progress Activities

- ✓ All 12 workforce development areas, with financial support from the Workforce Board, have established health skills panels. *Progress 2004* outlines a variety of activities to address shortages in local areas.
- ✓ Washington's \$3 million federal award for surpassing performance targets for workforce development programs has been utilized by Workforce Development Councils, in partnership with community and technical colleges and K-12, to fund health career workshops for youth, scholarships for students, and other programs.



## Task Force Committees in 2004

- ✓ **Core curricula committee:** Examined core curricula in health care programs used in other states, and Washington's first allied health core curricula developed by Yakima Valley Community College.
- ✓ **Faculty committees for nursing and allied health:** Made further recommendations for improving recruitment, retention, and diversity of faculty.
- ✓ **Website committee:** Examined youth website in other states, Michigan's found to be a good model, Yakima Valley Community College with assistance from other partners will coordinate the development of this site.



## Data Project for Targeting Resources

- ✓ The Workforce Board, in partnership with the Department of Health, contracted with the Social and Economic Science Research Center (SESRC) at Washington State University to assess available health care workforce data, determine gaps, and recommend a coordinated method for collection and maintenance.
- ✓ The Task Force recommends collection of data on the supply of health care personnel with the primary data elements outlined in the SESRC report (budget appropriation).



## 2005 Task Force Priorities

- Provide funds to health care education and training programs to expand capacity and allow for the higher costs of providing these programs (support budget requests).
- Increase availability, diversity, and retention of health care faculty in high demand health care programs that have difficulty recruiting faculty (support school programs to increase recruitment and retention and budget requests).
- Collect data on health workforce supply. This is critical to guide cost effective workforce planning (budget appropriation needed).



## Task Force 2005 Priorities (continued...)

- Provide health career exploration and adequately prepare youth for postsecondary health care programs (more health programs in high schools, work-based learning, youth website).
- Increase efficiency in health care education and training programs (expand Yakima Valley Community College's core curricula in allied health to other colleges and programs).
- Enable local areas to address their priority shortages (support budget request for skill panels).
  - See Task Force report "Crisis or Opportunity?" for full plan.
  - See *Progress 2004* report to Legislature – for full details on shortage status and progress activities.



For publications and other information go to the Task Force web page at:

**<http://www.wtb.wa.gov/HEALTHCARETASKFORCE.HTM>**

For further information please contact

Madeleine Thompson, Lead Staff to the Task Force

Telephone: (360) 753-5653

Email: [mthompson@wtb.wa.gov](mailto:mthompson@wtb.wa.gov)

**The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board**



